



Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission

September 27th DRAFT Meeting Notes

American Indian Center

NCEC member attendees: Doron Clark, John Finlayson, Ed Newman, Matt Perry, Jeff Strand, Mark Hinds, Tessa Trepp-Wetjen, Maria Sarabia, Christopher Hoffer, Tony Anastasia, Kenneth Brown, Crystal Johnson and Marcea Mariani.

NCEC members absent: Ali Warsame, Latrell Beamon, Carol Pass and Mark Hinds

Commission staff: Howard Blin, Robert Thompson, Carrie Day Aspinwall and Cheyenne Erickson

Agenda item	Content
1. Introduction, Meeting notes & agenda (Action)	<p>Action(s):</p> <p>Carrie Aspinwall, Neighborhood Specialist, welcomed the group to the American Indian Center. Carrie did a traditional smudge. Carrie welcomed elder, Diana Buckanaga, to give the traditional prayer.</p> <p>Approve September agenda - for review and approval – It was suggested to remove the Communications task force from the agenda, 5A. Consensus reached. It was suggested to remove 5C from the agenda. Consensus reached.</p> <p>Approve August notes - <i>for review and approval</i> - Discussion was held regarding the August meeting minutes. The following changes were made, and there was a possible discrepancy with the action of section 2(A), a commissioner questioned whether or not the decision was made by consensus or a vote. Staff will go back and look at the tape to verify. The information will need to be approved at the October NCEC meeting.</p> <p>Review Group Norms – Informational – A Commissioner cannot see the group norms at the bottom of the page. Update before next meeting.</p> <p>Schedule for Meeting Facilitators – The facilitation team will plan a facilitator schedule for 3 month periods. For October and November meetings Commissioner Clark will facilitate and Commissioner Strand will co-facilitate. Next month (October) the facilitation team will announce the next cycle of facilitators.</p>
2. NCR Report (Informational)	<p>Summary:</p> <p>One Minneapolis, One Read – There will be an event at the Guthrie Theater on Monday, October 3rd with author Michele Norris.</p> <p>1st Annual Community Connections Conference “Better Communities through Neighborhoods – Save the Date for Saturday, February 11th at the Zurah Shrine Center.</p> <p>Boards and Commissions – Fall Cycle applications are due by Friday, September 30th, there are currently 17 Boards and Commissions with openings.</p> <p>Presentation to City Council – Director Rubedor gave two presentations to City Council recently. The first presentation was the Budget presentation for the department and the second presentation was regarding the revisions/framework to neighborhood programming. Director Rubedor will be at the October NCEC meeting to discuss in more detail the revisions to the neighborhood programming. It was requested that NCR staff send out the presentations to the commission members.</p> <p>Office to End Homelessness – Cathy ten Broeke will attend in October to update NCEC of the work of her office.</p>
3. Revisions to the CPP Guidelines (Discussion)	<p>Summary:</p> <p>A.) Policy Issues: Commissioner Perry gave overview of policy decisions; at the last CoW meeting the CoW indicated a number of preferences to the policy decisions, but not all of them. Staff has a power point presentation to address outstanding policy</p>

decisions. NCEC will work to reach consensus on the outstanding policy decisions tonight and staff will be sending out a draft of the CPP guideline revisions based on the decisions made tonight.

Staff gave background information - the NRP joint powers agreement is sun setting at the end of this year and the current policy board will no longer exist, but the programs and funds will still be in effect. There will be a new policy board to be able to continue the past work.

A question was asked if the new plans need approval from the City Council, staff responded and said yes, the city council would approve plans at some level similar to how NRP Phase I & II plans are approved now.

A question was asked if the new NRP policy board will have the authority to change the CPP guidelines. Staff responded and said yes, if they have the authority to approve the plans for the next two years.

Staff and the NCEC reviewed the PowerPoint and made the following decisions.

Neighborhood Investment Fund (NIF) and Community Innovation Fund (CIF):

Question: Should development of NIF and CIF be taken up at future time?

- Resume development NIF and/or CIF when funding is available.
- Discontinue further development of NIF and CIF.

Cow indicated preference to resume development of NIF and CIF when funds available.

Discussion was held. It was asked what control the NCEC will have over this during the next two years. Will the NRP policy board create a program for these funds? Staff responded that there could be something that works out where NCEC develops policy and makes recommendations to policy board.

Action(s):

The Commission reached consensus to resume development of NIF and CIF in the future at a NCEC Committee of the Whole meeting.

Project Funding:

Community Engagement and planning is not in itself an eligible expense for use of NRP funds, but must result in real outcomes.

- Neighborhood organizations should identify priorities in "neighborhood priority plans."
- Projects will be guided by existing NRP policy.

There was no policy decision to be made; this was informational to the commission.

Relation to Existing NRP Plans:

Question 1: Can neighborhoods use CPP funds to support strategies in NRP plans?

Question 2: If yes, how do they direct use of CPP funds?

- Option 1: A neighborhood may direct use of CPP funds through a strategy appearing in a Phase II Plan.
- Option 2: A neighborhood can only direct use of CPP funds through a Neighborhood Priority Plan.

Discussion was held. A comment was made that current CPP guidelines already allow neighborhoods to use CPP money for planning. Allowing neighborhoods to use CPP funds for Phase II plans would make it very complicated to neighborhoods, NCR department and the NCEC to measure and account for what's going on. Doesn't want neighborhoods use strategies that they have already developed in Phase I & II to take them out and use them in their CPP guidelines. It would make it a lot easier for neighborhoods.

A question was asked if this was really CPP money for the next two years or is it NRP money. It appears to be NRP money and it will be managed by a different group than the NCEC. Staff responded that the source of the funds are NRP dollars, but the programming is still CPP programming and that is how it will be allocated to neighborhoods.

A Commissioner made the recommendation that it be made clearer that the NCEC will be dealing with NRP funds for two years.

A comment was made that Phase II planning took a substantial amount of time from neighborhoods. The decision that the NCEC makes today should have a minimal impact on neighborhoods.

A comment was made the capturing of the frozen Phase II money speaks to allowing option 1 for 2012 and 2013. For option 2 the transformational TIF money that was used to fund 2011 would be appropriate to only be expended through neighborhood priority plans. After 2013 neighborhood priority plans are the way to go, but if we are using consolidated TIF money we should allow neighborhoods to use it for Phase II planning. Keep it simple.

During the discussion two additional options were proposed:

Option 3: A neighborhood may direct use of CPP funds through a strategy appearing in a Phase II Plan or a priority plan.

Option 4: A neighborhood can only direct use of CPP funds through a Neighborhood Priority Plan with exceptions allowed.

Action(s):

The Commission voted in favor of Option 3, the facilitator abstained from the vote:

Option 1: 0

Option 2: 0

Option 3: 10

Option 4: 1

Three-Year Funding Cycle:

Question 1: How long should the allocation cycle be? (i.e., how often do we adjust allocations?)

Option 1: Continue three year allocation cycle

Option 2: Some other cycle.

Question 2: How often do neighborhoods need to provide submissions?

Option 1: Every three years (with allocation cycle)

Option 2: Every year.

Option 3: Flexible schedule.

Cow indicated preference for continuing three-year allocation after 2013, with one,

two, or three year submissions.

Discussion was held and a commissioner ask how we allocate money when we don't know if we have 3 years of funding, is it on a two year cycle or a one year cycle? Staff responded and said that the idea is that every three years we set the allocation and neighborhoods could look ahead and plan. Some neighborhoods are good at long term planning and other neighborhoods aren't. The other issue is that neighborhoods might be in other stages of planning and may want to do 1 year of funding while they plan out for the additional two years of funding.

A question was asked if we know at the start of the 3 year cycle what money they are talking about for 3 full years. Staff said there is a very good idea of how much money neighborhoods will have, but has yet to be allocated. There is an assumption that there will be money available even though it hasn't been allocated.

A comment was made that the money for the CPP program that won't exist for the next two years but will in the future is based on TIF districts that was funded the same as what NRP districts were has annual tax dollars coming into it. The question is what kind of framework we want to set for neighborhoods for their planning.

It was suggested that the commission should recommend a policy that creates a stable and adequate funding from October 2009. NRP allocation projects have been up and down as well as financial realities of the city, there have been different percentages guaranteed. In the future we should be more stable and less erratic.

Staff responded that this next two years of funding is unique like a commissioner stated previously. The 3 year funding cycle will allow neighborhoods to plan ahead and provide stability. But neighborhoods will still be contracting on an annual basis.

A commissioner suggested a good way to look at this is in layers, there is a contract layer, that's one year. There is the planning or the plan period for the submissions and staff has talked about maybe a 1, 2 or 3 year plan instead of the 1 and 3 year plan. Then there is the allocation which is suggested to be 3 years. The only reason we have to talk about allocations being different is because we don't have a program in place to address the use of NRP funds.

Action(s):

The Commission reached consensus on Question 1, Option 1 to continue three year allocation cycles.

The Commission reached consensus to get more input from neighborhoods regarding Question 2.

Fundraising:

Question 1: Should fundraising be an allowable expense:

- Yes, fundraising expenses is an eligible expense as long as outcomes are eligible under the CPP Guidelines.
- No, fundraising is not an eligible expense.

Question 2: Should fundraising revenue be reported as program income.

- Revenue should be reported.
- Revenue should not be reported.

Discussion was held. A commissioner suggested that it should read that funding raising expenses should be an eligible expense. Staff agreed and commission agreed.

A clarifying question was asked regarding Question 2, not whether or not is reported but if it's restricted to the CPP program. Staff responded that the practice with NRP was that if you did fundraising with NRP funds you would report back what you raise and that would be considered program dollars and had to be used toward program purposes.

A commissioner was concerned that neighborhoods may be spending more than they are raising. Would like to avoid neighborhoods burning more program money than necessary. Is there dollar, percentage limits proposed? The facilitator responded that while there is not a limit set the NCEC reviews all application and works with staff to make sure that neighborhoods are on the right track.

Action(s):

The Commission reached consensus on Question 1 as "yes" to allow fundraising expenses as an eligible expense as long as outcomes are eligible under CPP guidelines.

The Commission reached consensus on Question 2 that revenue from fundraising should be reported.

Organization Newsletters:

Background: Newsletters and publications that accept advertising will not be eligible for funding. Could be revisited by NRP Policy Board.

Summary: NCEC may make recommendation to NRP Policy Board at future time.

There was no policy decision to be made; this was informational to the commission.

Neighborhood Priority Plans:

Question: Should the Program Purposes be revised to include development of Neighborhood Priority Plans?

- Yes, the program purposes should be revised.
- No, the program purposes should not be revised.

Staff recommendation is to revise program purposes to clearly provide for development of neighborhood priority plans.

Action(s):

The commission reached consensus to approve the staff recommendation.

B.) Outstanding Issues: Additional policy decisions will be taken up at a later time, if you have suggestions or questions please direct them to NCR staff.

C.) Review Process: Staff reviewed the plan for the review process of the CPP guidelines. NCR will be putting out a series communications regarding the changes to neighborhood organizations as well as posting the information on the website. The NCR department will be holding 3 informational meetings. There will be a 45 day review process in to get feedback and input for the community. NCR staff ask that the commission help inform neighborhoods to get involved and to provide feedback.

A request was made that commissioners go out and meet with neighborhoods and would like NCR staff to help coordinate these efforts so Commissioners aren't going to

the same locations.

A comment was made that a commissioner would like to get feedback from neighborhoods on the entirety of the CPP guidelines and that feedback get captured as well, not just feedback on the revisions.

Action(s):

The Commission reached consensus for NCR staff to move forward with the review process without sentiment from the NCEC.

4. Bylaws Task Force (Action)

Summary:

Commissioner Newman reviewed the document and explained the background. The goal is to finish the work by end of January 2012 to report back to the Commission at the February 2012 meeting.

Commissioner Perry put forth a new charge with broader language and scope so that the commission would not have to create another task force when the work of this current task force is completed in February 2012.

A commissioner commented that the new scope allows the task force to look at all bylaws. It can choose to look at narrower scope and still report back in February 2012.

Commissioner Newman thought that bullet point 3 would cover Commissioner Perry's concerns, but is willing to accept Commissioner Perry's new language/charge, if the other task force members who helped in creating the charge were in agreement. Commissioner Newman then suggested that extending the date of the duration/time commitment section to May 31st.

Action(s):

The Commission reached consensus to extend the date of the duration/time commitment to May 31st in the original charge that was put forth by the Task Force members.

The Commission voted on the two options of the charges presented. The original charge received 7 votes; the second charge received 3 votes.

5. Task Force Reports
(Discussion and Informational)

Summary:

City Department Engagement Task Force – The task force continues to meet regularly, currently looking at case studies of projects around the city. The next task force meeting will be held Wednesday, October 19th at the NCR office.